

SUMMARY

CRIME INDEX

for the United States

1996

CRIMES CLEARED

PERSONS ARRESTED

TOPICAL STUDY

PRINTED ANNUALLY

Federal Bureau of Investigation U.S. Department of Justice Washington, D.C. 20535

ADVISORY:

Committee on Uniform Crime Records
International Association of Chiefs of Police;
Committee on Uniform Crime Reporting
National Sheriffs' Association;
Criminal Justice Information Services Advisory Policy Board

LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL

APPENDICES

PREFACE

Each year *Crime in the United States* presents crime statistics for the Nation as a whole, as well as for regions, states, counties, cities, towns, and college and university campuses. These data are compiled from monthly law enforcement reports or individual crime incident records transmitted directly to the FBI or to centralized state agencies that then report to the FBI. The primary objective of the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program is to provide a reliable set of criminal justice statistics for law enforcement administration, operation, and management.

UCR crime statistics permit studies among neighboring jurisdictions and among those with similar populations and other common characteristics. In addition, a study of the nature and movement of crime over time allows researchers to theorize about the causes underlying changes and fluctuations and to hypothesize about possible effects on families and communities. A study of the crime data for a specific geographic locale enables researchers to assess the influence of crime on a particular district. For these reasons, UCR data are used not only by criminal justice agencies but by university researchers, sociologists, criminologists, community development organizations, tourism agencies, media, and many others. Each year the Uniform Crime Reporting Program strives to compile and present the facts and the many facets of crime in the United States in ways that will assist all students of crime data.

This current edition includes for the first time a presentation of the reported data on those Index crimes which are motivated by bias against individuals based upon race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity. The hate crime data are extracts of those to be reported in the annual publication, *Hate Crime Statistics*. Produced since 1992, they provide an important additional perspective on the Nation's crime experience and are a positive addition to the historical crime report.

As the 21st century approaches, the Uniform Crime Reporting Program shares with state and local law enforcement an ever-increasing commitment to implement fully the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS). The foundation of the national system will be the thousands of automated records-management systems that are being developed within individual agencies across the Nation. Within the next few years, *information* may prove to be law enforcement's most important weapon. Many progressive computerized systems have the capacity not only to compile crime statistics but to link all associated criminal justice information systems. Good automated systems generate data that benefit officers in patrol cars as much as detectives and prosecutors. They also produce the statistical reports required for NIBRS.

The UCR staff continues to support and encourage law enforcement's efforts to develop computerized data collection systems through research, training, and technical assistance. Recently, Austin, Texas, became the first city with over 500,000 population to institute NIBRS reporting as part of a comprehensive, incident-based, automated records-management system. As more and more agencies, large and small, become part of NIBRS, the FBI will be able to offer more comprehensive national and regional crime statistics for use in law enforcement decisionmaking at all levels of government.

The Uniform Crime Reporting Program staff, now fully established in Clarksburg, West Virginia, is looking to the future with optimism and a commitment to maintain the high standards that have characterized the Program from its inception.

CRIME FACTORS

Each year when *Crime in the United States* is published, many entities—news media, tourism agencies, and other groups with an interest in crime in our Nation—use reported Crime Index figures to compile rankings of cities and counties. These rankings lead to simplistic and/or incomplete analyses which often create misleading perceptions adversely affecting cities and counties, along with their residents. Assessing criminality and law enforcement's response from jurisdiction to jurisdiction must encompass many elements, some of which, while having significant impact, are not readily measurable nor applicable pervasively among all locales. Geographic and demographic factors specific to each jurisdiction must be considered and applied if crime assessment is to approach completeness and accuracy. There are several sources of information which may assist the responsible researcher. The U.S. Bureau of the Census data, for example, can be utilized to better understand the makeup of a locale's population. The transience of the population, its racial and ethnic makeup, its composition by age and gender, education levels, and prevalent family structures are all key factors in assessing and comprehending the crime issue.

Local chambers of commerce, planning offices, or similar entities provide information regarding the economic and cultural makeup of cities and counties. Understanding a jurisdiction's industrial/economic base, its dependence upon neighboring jurisdictions, its transportation system, its economic dependence on nonresidents (such as tourists and convention attendees), its proximity to military installations, etc., all contribute to accurately gauging and interpreting the crime known to and reported by law enforcement.

The strength (personnel and other resources) and the aggressiveness of a jurisdiction's law enforcement agency are also key factors. While information pertaining to the number of sworn and civilian law enforcement employees can be found in this publication, assessment of the law enforcement emphases is, of course, much more difficult. For example, one city may report more crime than a comparable one, not because there is more crime, but rather because its law enforcement agency through proactive efforts identifies more offenses. Attitudes of the citizens toward crime and their crime reporting practices, especially concerning more minor offenses, have an impact on the volume of crimes known to police.

It is incumbent upon all data users to become as well educated as possible about how to categorize and quantify the nature and extent of crime in the United States and in any of the over 16,000 jurisdictions represented by law enforcement contributors to this Program. Valid assessments are possible only with careful study and analysis of the various unique conditions affecting each local law enforcement jurisdiction.

Historically, the causes and origins of crime have been the subjects of investigation by varied disciplines. Some factors which are known to affect the volume and type of crime occurring from place to place are:

Population density and degree of urbanization.

Variations in composition of the population, particularly youth concentration.

Stability of population with respect to residents' mobility, commuting patterns, and transient factors.

Modes of transportation and highway system.

Economic conditions, including median income, poverty level, and job availability.

Cultural factors and educational, recreational, and religious characteristics.

Family conditions with respect to divorce and family cohesiveness.

Climate.

Effective strength of law enforcement agencies.

Administrative and investigative emphases of law enforcement.

Policies of other components of the criminal justice system (i.e., prosecutorial, judicial, correctional, and probational).

Citizens' attitudes toward crime.

Crime reporting practices of the citizenry.

The Uniform Crime Reports give a nationwide view of crime based on statistics contributed by state and local law enforcement agencies. Population size is the only correlate of crime utilized in this publication. While the other factors listed above are of equal concern, no attempt is made to relate them to the data presented. The reader is, therefore, cautioned against comparing statistical data of individual reporting units from cities, counties, metropolitan areas, states, or colleges and universities solely on the basis of their population coverage or student enrollment.

Data users are cautioned against comparisons of crime trends presented in this report and those estimated by the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), administered by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Because of differences in methodology and crime coverage, the two programs examine the Nation's crime problem from somewhat different perspectives, and their results are not strictly comparable. The definitional and procedural differences can account for many of the apparent discrepancies in results from the two programs.

CONTENTS

	Page
Section I — Summary of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program	1
Section II — Crime Index Offenses Reported	5
Narrative comments:	3
Crime Index Total	5
Violent Crime:	10
Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	13
Forcible rape	23
Robbery	
Aggravated assault	31
Property Crime:	35
Burglary	38
Larceny-theft	43
Motor vehicle theft	49
Arson	53
Hate Crime	57
Crime Index Tabulations	61
Crinic fildex Tabulations	01
Charts:	
Crime clock, 1996	4
Crime Index total, 1992-1996	7
Crime Index total, 1992-1990 Crime Index offenses, percent distribution, 1996	8
Regional violent and property crime rates, 1996.	9
Violent crime, 1992-1996	12
Murder, 1992-1996	15
Forcible rape, 1992-1996	25
Robbery, 1992-1996	28
Robbery analysis, 1992-1996	30
Aggravated assault, 1992-1996	33
Property crime, 1992-1996	33 37
Burglary, 1992-1996	40
Burglary analysis, 1992-1996	41
Larceny–theft, 1992-1996	45
·	45
Larceny analysis, 1992-1996 Larceny analysis, 1996	47
Motor vehicle theft, 1992-1996	51
	59
Bias motivation, 1996	39
Tables:	
Crime Index total by month, percent of annual total, 1992-1996	6
Violent crime total by month, percent of annual total, 1992-1996	6 11
Murder:	11
By month, percent of annual total, 1992-1996	14
	14
Victims by race and sex, 1996	
Age, sex, and race of victims, 1996	16
Age, sex, and race of offenders, 1996	16
Victim/offender relationship by age, 1996	17
Victim/offender relationship by race and sex, 1996	17
Types of weapons used, 1996	18
Victims, types of weapons used, 1992-1996	18
Victims, types of weapons used, 1996	18

Tables — Continued	Page
Circumstances by relationship, 1996	19
Circumstances by weapon, 1996	20
Circumstances, 1992-1996	21
Circumstances by victim sex, 1996	21
Justifiable homicide by weapon, 1992-1996:	
Law enforcement	22
Private citizen	22
Forcible rape, by month, percent of annual total, 1992-1996	24
Robbery:	
By month, percent of annual total, 1992-1996	27
Percent distribution, region, 1996	27
Percent distribution, population group, 1996	29
Types of weapons used, 1996	29
Aggravated assault:	
By month, percent of annual total, 1992-1996	32
Types of weapons used, 1996	32
Property crime total by month, percent of annual total, 1992-1996	36
Burglary, by month, percent of annual total, 1992-1996	39
Larceny-theft:	
By month, percent of annual total, 1992-1996	44
Percent distribution, region, 1996	44
Motor vehicle theft:	
By month, percent of annual total, 1992-1996	50
Percent distribution, region, 1996	50
Arson, 1996:	
Rate, population group	54
Type of property	54
Structures not in use	55
Monetary value of property damaged	55
Offenses cleared by arrest	55
Offenses cleared by arrest of persons under 18 years of age	55
Hate Crime, 1996:	
Number of offenses	58
Agency hate crime, state	60
Index of crime:	
United States, 1977-1996	62
United States, 1996	63
Regional offense and population distribution, 1996	63
Region, geographic division, and state, 1995-1996	64
State, 1996	72
Metropolitan Statistical Areas, 1996	84
Offense analysis, United States, 1992-1996	111
Number of offenses known to the police, 1996:	
Cities and towns 10,000 and over in population	112
Universities and colleges	157
Suburban counties	166
Rural counties 25,000 and over in population	179
Crime trends, offenses known to the police, 1995-1996:	
Population group	187
Suburban and nonsuburban cities, population group	189
Suburban and nonsuburban counties, population group	190
Offense breakdown, population group	191

Tables — Continued	Page
Crime rates, offenses known to the police, 1996:	
Population group	193
Suburban and nonsuburban cities, population group	195
Suburban and nonsuburban counties, population group	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	197
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	199
Robbery, state, types of weapons, 1996	
Aggravated assault, state, types of weapons, 1996	
Offense analysis, 1996, and percent change from 1995	
	202
Type and value of property stolen and recovered, 1990	202
	203
Narrative comments	203
Chart:	
Crimes cleared by arrest, 1996	204
Tables:	
Offenses known and percent cleared by arrest, 1996:	
Population group	205
Geographic region and division	207
Offense breakdown, population group	209
Offenses cleared by arrest of persons under 18 years of age, 1996	211
Section IV — Persons Arrested	213
	213
Tables:	
Arrests for drug abuse violations, 1996	
Total estimated arrests, United States, 1996	214
Arrests, number and rate, 1996:	
6	215
	216
Total arrest trends:	• • •
-, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -	218
Sex, 1987-1996	
1992-1996	
Sex, 1992-1996	221
1995-1996	222
Sex, 1995-1996	223
Total arrests, 1996:	224
Distribution by age	224
Male arrests, distribution by age	226
Female arrests, distribution by age	228
	230
Distribution by sex	231
Distribution by race	232
City arrest trends:	235
1995-1996	235
Sex, 1995-1996	230
City arrests, 1996: Distribution by age	237
Of persons under 15, 18, 21, and 25 years of age	237
Distribution by sex	240
Distribution by race	241

Tables — Continued	Pag
Suburban county arrest trends:	
1995-1996	244
Sex, 1995-1996	245
Suburban county arrests, 1996:	
Distribution by age	246
Of persons under 15, 18, 21, and 25 years of age	248
Distribution by sex	249
Distribution by race	250
Rural county arrest trends:	
1995-1996	253
Sex, 1995-1996	254
Rural county arrests, 1996:	
Distribution by age	255
Of persons under 15, 18, 21, and 25 years of age	257
Distribution by sex	258
Distribution by race	259
Suburban area arrest trends:	
1995-1996	262
Sex, 1995-1996	263
Suburban area arrests, 1996:	
Distribution by age	264
Of persons under 15, 18, 21, and 25 years of age	266
Distribution by sex	
Distribution by race	
Police disposition of juvenile offenders taken into custody, 1996	
Arrests by state, 1996	
·	
ection V — Drugs in America: 1980-1995	280
Tarrative comments	280
ables:	
Percent changes in the estimated number of drug arrests by type,	
United States, 1995 over 1980, 1985, and 1990	280
Percent changes in estimated number of drug arrests by region,	
United States, 1995 over 1990	280
Percent distribution of total drug arrests by sale/manufacture and possession, United States, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	280
Percent distribution of total drug arrests by race, United States, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	
Percent changes in the estimated number of heroin/cocaine and marijuana arrests by race, United States, 1995 over 1990	282
Tharts:	202
Estimated drug arrests, United States, 1980-1995	281
Estimated heroin/cocaine arrests, United States, 1980-1995	
Estimated marijuana arrests, United States, 1980-1995	
Estimated marijuana arrests, United States, 1980-1995	
Estimated synthetic drug arrests, United States, 1980-1995	
Estimated other drug arrests, United States, 1980-1995 Estimated adult drug arrests, United States, 1980-1995	283
Estimated adult drug arrests, United States, 1980-1995	
ection VI — Law Enforcement Personnel	
Jarrative comments	285
Tables:	
Full-time law enforcement employees, October 31, 1996:	
Employees, number and rate per 1,000 inhabitants, geographic region	
and division by population group	286

Tables — Continued	Page
Officers, number and rate per 1,000 inhabitants, geographic region	
and division by population group	287
Employees, range in rate per 1,000 inhabitants	288
Officers, range in rate per 1,000 inhabitants	
Employees, percent male and female	290
Civilian employees, percent of total, population group	
State law enforcement agencies	
States	292
Cities	293
Universities and colleges	365
Suburban counties	371
Rural counties	376
Section VII — Appendices	388
Appendix I — Methodology	388
Appendix II — Offenses in Uniform Crime Reporting	395
Appendix III — Uniform Crime Reporting Area Definitions	396
Appendix IV — The Nation's Two Crime Measures	399
Appendix V — Directory of State Uniform Crime Reporting Programs	401
Appendix VI — National Uniform Crime Reporting Program Directory	407
Appendix VII — Uniform Crime Reporting Publications List	408